

1 SHEPPARD, MULLIN, RICHTER & HAMPTON LLP
A Limited Liability Partnership

2 Including Professional Corporations
BRYAN D. DALY, Cal. Bar No. 117901

3 bdaly@sheppardmullin.com
CHARLES L. KREINDLER, Cal. Bar No. 119933

4 ckreindler@sheppardmullin.com
BARBARA E. TAYLOR, Cal. Bar No. 166374

5 btaylor@sheppardmullin.com
333 South Hope Street, 43rd Floor
6 Los Angeles, California 90071-1422

Telephone: 213.620.1780

7 Facsimile: 213.620.1398

8 Attorneys for Individual Counterclaim
Defendants Michael Omid, M.D. and
9 Julian Omid

10 DARON L. TOOCH (State Bar No. 137269)

ERIC D. CHAN (State Bar No. 253082)

11 KATHERINE M. DRU (State Bar No. 280231)

HOOPER, LUNDY & BOOKMAN, P.C.

12 1875 Century Park East, Suite 1600

Los Angeles, California 90067-2517

13 Telephone: (310) 551-8111

Facsimile: (310) 551-8181

14 E-Mail: dtooch@health-law.com

15 Attorneys for Plaintiffs and Counterclaim
Defendants Almont Ambulatory Surgery
16 Center, LLC, et al.

17 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

18 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, WESTERN DIVISION
19

20 ALMONT AMBULATORY
21 SURGERY CENTER, LLC, a
22 California limited liability company, et
al.,

23 Plaintiffs,

24 v.

25 UNITEDHEALTH GROUP, INC.;
26 UNITED HEALTHCARE SERVICES,
INC., UNITED HEALTHCARE
27 INSURANCE COMPANY;
OPTUMINSIGHT, INC., and DOES 1
through 20,

28 Defendants.

Case No. 2:14-cv-03053-MWF(VBKx)
Hon. Michael W. Fitzgerald

[Related to Case No. 2:14-cv-02139]

**COUNTERCLAIM DEFENDANTS'
NOTICE OF MOTION AND
MOTION FOR AN ORDER:**

**(1) RELEASING TO
COUNTERCLAIM DEFENDANTS
ONLY FOR *IN CAMERA* REVIEW
AFFIDAVITS FILED UNDER SEAL
IN SUPPORT OF WARRANTS; OR**

**(2) IN THE ALTERNATIVE,
RECUSING MAGISTRATE**

1 UNITED HEALTHCARE SERVICES,
2 INC., UNITED HEALTHCARE
INSURANCE COMPANY;
3 OPTUMINSIGHT, INC.,

Counterclaim Plaintiffs,

4 v.

5 ALMONT AMBULATORY
6 SURGERY CENTER, LLC, a
California limited liability company; et
7 al.,

Counterclaim Defendants.

**JUDGE: MEMORANDUM OF
POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN
SUPPORT**

[28 U.S.C. § 455(a); Local Rule 72-5]

[Proposed] Order and Declaration of
Charles L. Kreindler filed concurrently]

Hearing

Date: Monday, February 2, 2015

Time: 10:00 a.m.

Courtroom: 1600, 16th Floor, 312 N.
Spring Street

Discovery Cutoff: None Set

Pretrial Conference Date: None Set

Trial Date: None Set

1 TO THE ABOVE-CAPTIONED COURT AND TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR
 2 ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

3 PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on February 2, 2015, at 10:00 a.m., or as soon
 4 thereafter as counsel may be heard, before the Honorable Michael W. Fitzgerald, in
 5 Courtroom 1600, 16th Floor of the United States District Court, Central District of
 6 California, located at 312 N. Spring Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012-4701,
 7 Individual Counterclaim Defendants Michael Omid, M.D. and Julian Omid and
 8 Plaintiffs and Counterclaim Defendants Almont Ambulatory Surgery Center, LLC,
 9 et al. (collectively "Counterclaim Defendants") will and hereby do move, pursuant
 10 to 28 U.S.C. § 455(a) and Local Rule 72-5, for: (1) an order releasing to
 11 Counterclaim Defendants only for *in camera* review the Government's affidavits
 12 filed under seal in support of warrants Magistrate Judge Victor B. Kenton issued in
 13 connection with the ongoing criminal investigation of Counterclaim Defendants to
 14 aid Counterclaim Defendants in determining whether to seek recusal of Magistrate
 15 Judge Kenton from this action and Case No. 2:14-cv-02139, to which this action is
 16 related and in which certain Counterclaim Defendants are Plaintiffs (together
 17 "Actions"); or, in the alternative (2) an order recusing Magistrate Judge Kenton
 18 from the Actions. This Motion is made on the ground that Magistrate Judge
 19 Kenton's "impartiality might reasonably be questioned" because of his knowledge
 20 of the contents of the affidavits filed under seal in support of the warrants he issued.

21 This Motion is based upon this Notice, the concurrently filed Declaration of
 22 Charles L. Kreindler, all pleadings and other papers filed in this case, matters of
 23 which the Court may take judicial notice, and such oral argument as may be
 24 presented at the hearing on this Motion.

25 This Motion is made following the conference of counsel pursuant to Local
 26 Rule 7-3 that took place on December 23, 2014.

1 Dated: January 5, 2015

2 Respectfully submitted,

3 SHEPPARD, MULLIN, RICHTER & HAMPTON LLP
4

5 By /s/ Charles L. Kreindler

6 CHARLES L. KREINDLER

7 Attorneys for Individual Counterclaim

8 Defendants Michael Omid, M.D.

and Julian Omid

9 Dated: January 5, 2015

HOOPER, LUNDY & BOOKMAN, P.C.

10
11
12 By: /s/Daron L. Tooch

13 DARON L. TOOCH

14 Attorneys for Plaintiffs and Counterclaim

15 Defendants Almont Ambulatory Surgery

Center, LLC, et al.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

Litigants have a constitutional right to due process, which includes a fair and detached judge to preside over their judicial proceedings. (*See Ward v. Village of Monroeville*, 409 U.S. 57, 61-62 (1972).) Under 28 U.S.C. § 455(a): “Any justice, judge, or magistrate judge of the United States shall disqualify himself in any proceeding in which his impartiality might reasonably be questioned.” The test for recusal under subdivision (a) of section 455 is “whether a reasonable person with knowledge of all the facts would conclude that the judge’s impartiality might reasonably be questioned.” (*Hamid v. Price Waterhouse*, 51 F.3d 1411, 1416 (9th Cir. 1995).)

Here, Magistrate Judge Kenton, who hears discovery matters in the Actions, informed the parties during a discovery hearing on December 12, 2014 that he would “likely” recuse himself should Counterclaim Defendants move for his recusal because he had issued warrants in connection with the ongoing criminal investigation of Counterclaim Defendants. (*See* Declaration of Charles L. Kreindler [“Kreindler Decl.”], ¶¶1-2 & Exh. A [pp. 17:25-20:22].) In issuing the warrants, Magistrate Judge Kenton became privy to the contents of the Government’s affidavits filed under seal in support. (*Id.*, ¶2 & Exh. A [pp. 18:19-25, 19:13-22].) Those warrants were executed in 2014. (*Id.*, ¶2.)

Since Magistrate Judge Kenton has become familiar with at least some of the issues in the Actions, having already heard and ruled on two discovery motions in Case No. 2:14-cv-03053 (DKT 91 & 92), recusal will entail some duplication of effort and inefficiencies. Consequently, Counterclaim Defendants would prefer to avoid recusal unless it is ***necessary*** to ensure impartiality. Counterclaim Defendants believe that they cannot make a fully informed determination regarding the ***necessity*** for recusal without knowing what information Magistrate Judge Kenton was exposed to in the Government’s affidavits. (Kreindler Decl., ¶3.) Thus, in the first instance, Counterclaim Defendants request that the Government’s affidavits be

1 released *in camera* to them only to make that determination. Counterclaim
 2 Defendants have a constitutional right to examine the affidavits in support of the
 3 warrants now that they have been executed. (*See In re Search Warrants Issued Aug.*
 4 *29, 1994*, 889 F.Supp. 296, 299 (S.D. Ohio 1995) (Fourth Amendment rights
 5 “include[] the right to examine the affidavit that supports a warrant after the search
 6 has been conducted”); *In re Search of 8420 Ocean Gateway Easton, Md.*, 353
 7 F.Supp.2d 577, 579 (D. Md. 2004) (finding post-search “Fourth Amendment
 8 constitutional right to examine the search warrant affidavit”).) The “pre-indictment
 9 right of access” to affidavits supporting warrants has been recognized by courts
 10 nationwide, including in the Ninth Circuit. (*In re Searches & Seizures*, No. 08-SW-
 11 0361, 2008 WL 5411772 at *3 (E.D. Cal. Dec. 19, 2008 (collecting cases).)

12 In the alternative, if it is not possible for the Government’s affidavits to be
 13 released to them for *in camera* review, then Counterclaim Defendants believe that
 14 the test for recusal—“impartiality might reasonably be questioned”—has been met,
 15 and request an order for recusal of Magistrate Judge Kenton and assignment of
 16 another Magistrate Judge to hear discovery matters in the Actions.

17
 18 Dated: January 5, 2015

19 Respectfully submitted,

20 SHEPPARD, MULLIN, RICHTER & HAMPTON LLP
 21

22 By /s/ Charles L. Kreindler
 23 CHARLES L. KREINDLER
 24 Attorneys for Individual Counterclaim
 25 Defendants Michael Omid, M.D.
 26 and Julian Omid
 27
 28

1 Dated: January 5, 2015

HOOPER, LUNDY & BOOKMAN, P.C.

2
3
4 By: /s/Daron L. Tooch

DARON L. TOOCH

5 Attorneys for Plaintiffs and Counterclaim
6 Defendants Almont Ambulatory Surgery
7 Center, LLC, et al.
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28